

Appl. No. 10/783,342

Amdt. Dated Apr. 20, 2005

Reply to Office Action of Feb. 7, 2005

Amendments to the Drawings

FIGS. 1-5 are amended to add reference numerals 800, 700 and 243 to illustrate the lateral opening of the assembled cover members 3, 4, the lateral opening of the assembled shells 21, 22, and the hook 243 of the arm 242 to support the newly added claim 27 which defines the relationship among these three elements.

Attachments

Appl. No. 10/783,342
Amdt. Dated Apr. 20, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Feb. 7, 2005

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully appreciates the allowance of claims 17-22.

Drawings objections under 37 CFR 1.83(a)

The drawing are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The examiner refers to the limitations regarding *the assembly of the upper shell to the lower shell by rotation where the upper shell is initially at an upwardly oblique angle etc..*

Applicant has canceled claims 23 and 24 relating to these features.

Thus, removal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Claim objections

Claim 25 is objected to because of the following informalities: There is a grammatical problem with the wording in the last two lines.

Applicant has amended claim 25 to overcome the objection stated in the action. Objection thereto is respectfully traversed. If there are any deficiencies still in claim 25, the Examiner may instruct the applicant for further amendments.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has deleted the limitation "for consideration of molding" as defined in original claim 26 to see above objection stated in the action. Thus, removal of these rejections to claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. 112 is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/783,342
Amdt. Dated Apr. 20, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Feb. 7, 2005

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1, 7, 12-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sauder in view of Whiting et al.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner's opinion. Detailed explanations are given below.

Regarding independent claim 1, an electrical connector as defined therein comprises a shielded connector and a cover. The shielded connector comprises a terminal subassembly having an insulating housing and a plurality of terminals received in the housing, a lower shell and an upper shell attached to the lower shell. The lower shell has a base plate, **a mating frame in a front end of the base plate for receiving the terminal subassembly**, and a pair of sidewalls upwardly extending from the base plate. The upper shell has a cover plate and a pair of sidewalls downwardly extending from the cover plate. The cover comprises a first cover member, a second cover member, a positioning means and a latching means. The positioning means comprises at least one pillow provided in one of the first and second cover members, and at least one cutout defined in the other cover member for receiving said at least one pillow. The latching means comprises a detent disposed in said at least one pillow, and **a latching tab** projecting from said at least one cutout and having **an opening for latchably engaging with said detent**.

Examiner believes that number 70 and number 76, 88 of Sauder respectively designates a base plate of the present application and a mating frame in a front end of the base plate for receiving the terminal subassembly. As a matter of fact, Sauder failed to disclose this feature. For example, referring to the disclosure of Sauder along with FIGS. 1, 2 and 4, it is clearly recited in column 2, lines 53-56 that *a portion of rear wall 76 is folded over to provide cable exit 86 and extension 88*

Appl. No. 10/783,342
Amndt. Dated Apr. 20, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Feb. 7, 2005

having ribs 90 for engaging shielding on cable 52, and it is recited in column 3, lines 4-6 that *forward edge 98 of an end wall 74 engages the rear of connector 22 to secure connector 22 in the latched shields as shown in FIG. 2*. From the above description, it is obvious that the rear wall 76 and the extension 88 are formed in a back end of a generally wall 70 for receiving a cable 52 while without receiving the connector 22. According, Sauder fails to disclose a mating frame in a front end of the base plate for receiving the terminal subassembly. Therefore, Sauder is materially different from the present application.

Furthermore, Sauder DOES NOT disclose a latching tab having an opening for latchably engaging with the detent as defined in claim 1. Although Whiting discloses a latch having an opening therein, Whiting DOES NOT still disclose a lower shell and an upper shell as defined in the present invention. Thus, combination of Sauder and Whiting cannot render obvious the instant invention as defined in claim 1. Claim 1 is patentable over Sauder in view of Whiting.

Claims 7, 12-14 and 16 are also believed to be patentable since they depend from claim 1, either directly or indirectly.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Huss, Jr. et al.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner's opinion. Detailed explanations are given below.

First of all, Applicant has amended "cover" to "cap" to precisely define the intended claimed features. Applicant apologize for any misunderstanding from the Examiner due to possible misleading in the original terminology of "cover".

Appl. No. 10/783,342
Amdt. Dated Apr. 20, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Feb. 7, 2005

Applicant recognizes freedom of interpreting the claim languages for the Examiner. Anyhow, essentially in Huss Jr. et al. the alleged cover (28, 30), i.e., *the outer part*, surrounds the shell (24, 26), i.e., *the medium part*, which forms the alleged open mating port, and the alleged mating tongue blade (44), i.e., *the inner part*, is enclosed in the alleged open mating port. This structural relationship among these three outer, medium and inner elements is in sequence. Thus, in Huss Jr. et al. it is impossible for the alleged cover (28, 30), i.e., *the outer part*, to only receive mating tongue blade (44), i.e., *the inner part*, while still exposing the open mating port, i.e., *the medium part*.

Therefore, the Examiner's rejection is baseless. Anyhow, Applicant has amended claim 25 to specifically refer such assembling/shielding/covering to the *front-to-back mating direction*. Clearly, the alleged cover (28, 30) is assembled to and covers the mating tongue blade 44 only in a vertical direction rather than the front-to-back mating direction. Therefore, claim 25 as amended, is believed to patentably distinguish over Huss Jr. et al..

Claim 26 is also believed to be patentable not only because it depends directly from claim 25 but also because (I) the finger and the through hole are aligned with each in the front-to-back mating direction (II) for removing the cap from the mating tongue blade.

Differently, in Huss Jr. et al., the alleged projection 108 and the alleged through hole (108) are essentially aligned with each other in the vertical direction for securing the two cover halves together, and the projection is for locking rather than being the accessible part for removal of the cover from the mating tongue blade.

The newly added claim 27 defines *the lateral opening (800) of the cover*

Appl. No. 10/783,342
Amdt. Dated Apr. 20, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Feb. 7, 2005

members is laterally aligned with the lateral opening (700) of the shells to expose the hook (243) of the pull tab in a lateral direction. Differently, neither Sauder nor Huss discloses this feature. Understandably, the lateral openings (800, 700) may allow the user to inspect or adjust the corresponding hook (243) of the pull tab when mated with the complementary connector for assuring proper function of the hook (243). Thus, claim 27 is believed to patentably distinguish over the cited references.

In view of the above claim amendments and remarks, the subject application is believed to be in a condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
JERRY WU

By 

Wei Te Chung

Registration No.: 43,325
Foxconn International, Inc.
P. O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive,
Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel No.: (408) 919-6137